THE ANGLICAN

A QUARTERLY NEWS-LETTER OF THE AMERICAN BRANCH OF THE ANGLICAN SOCIETY

The objects of the American Branch of the Anglican Society are:

1. To promote and preserve the Catholic Faith in strict accordance with the principles laid down by the Book of Common Prayer.

2. To uphold and appreciate the Anglican Use both in rite and ceremonial.

Membership is invited on the broad principle of loyalty to the American Prayer Book, Constitution and Canons and the Common Law of the Anglican Communion. Apply to either the Secretary or the Chairman of the Extension Committee for membership. The dues are $2.00 a year which includes subscription to "The Anglican."

SPRING 1949

VOL. V, NO. 1

PRAYER BOOK THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY 1952

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Excerpts from the Address of The Very Reverend Edward R. Welles at the Annual Dinner of The Anglican Society Held in New York, January 20th, 1949 3

Report on the Annual Meeting. By the Rev. Charles E. Hill 5

Some Sources of Common Prayer. By the Rev. J. Joseph Meekin Harte 6

The Consecration of the Eucharist (Continued). By the Editor 8

The Movement of the Liturgy! (Continued). By the Editor 17

THE ANGLICAN SOCIETY

REGIONAL MEETING

To commemorate the 400th Anniversary of the first English Book of Common Prayer (authorized for use on and after June 9th 1549) to be held at St. Paul's Cathedral, Shelton Square, Buffalo, New York, on Thursday, June 9th, 1949.

PROGRAM

11:00 A. M. The Holy Communion (celebrated, by permission of the Bishop of the Diocese, according to the rite of the Prayer Book of 1549). Celebrant: The Very Reverend Edward R. Welles, Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, Buffalo; President of The Anglican Society (American Branch). Preacher: The Rt. Rev. Austin Pardue, D. D., Bishop of Pittsburgh.

12:45 P. M. Lunch. Speaker: The Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife, D. D., Bishop of Western New York. (NOTE: Reservations for the lunch ($1.00) must be made either by mail, 128 Pearl Street, Buffalo 2, New York, or by telephone, CLeveland 1804, not later than June 7th.)

2:00 P. M. Afternoon meeting. Speakers: The Hon. William R. Castle, of Washington, D. C., former Undersecretary of State. Topic: The Prayer Book and the Laity. The Rev. William H. Dunphy, Ph. D., Rector of St. Mark's Church, Philadelphia; Editor of "The Anglican." Topic: The Spirit, the Body, and the Book.

NOTICE

The American Branch of The Anglican Society will discontinue sending copies of "The English Catholic" to its membership in view of the greatly increased cost of its subscription together with the greatly increased cost of printing our own Quarterly. Americans may send their subscriptions for "The English Catholic" either direct to England or to the American Agent, the Rev. Canon Charles E. Hill, in Williamstown, Massachusetts ($1.00 per year). We originally supplied subscriptions to "The English Catholic" to our American members because we had no quarterly magazine of our own, but now we have one and must pay very heavily to have it printed and we can no longer afford, on the modest annual dues of $2.00 a year, to send both magazines to our members.

(Very Rev.) Edward R. Welles.

CORRECTION

The gremlins who preside over the task of making an Editor's life miserable got busy in connection with the Christmas issue of "The Anglican." He was criticizing certain features of the "Missals" used in place of the Prayer Book, and the prayer said by the Priest as he goes up to the Altar: "We beseech Thee, O Lord, by the merits of thy Saints, that Thou wouldst forgive me all my sins." The gremlin substituted "sins" for "saints." Will critics kindly apply to the editor the words of the gentler spirit in "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner":

"The Man hath penance alone, said he,
And Penance more will do"

EXCERPTS FROM THE ADDRESS OF THE VERY REVEREND EDWARD R. WELLES

At the Annual Dinner of The Anglican Society Held in New York, January 20th, 1949.

The Anglican Society is a Prayer Book Society and therefore we are participating enthusiastically, this year, in the 400th Anniversary of the first English Book of Common Prayer published in 1549. This book was truly one of the greatest achievements in our Church's long history. All the services found in different service books were combined and translated from the Latin into glorious English by Archbishop Cranmer and others, and published in a single Book of Common Prayer in that year. Other revisions in England have been made in 1552, 1559, and 1662. This meant three revisions in the first decade, then the last authorized revision a century later, and now for almost three centuries, no new revision. In 1927 and 1928 the Church in England attempted revisions but Parliament thwarted these attempts.

The Anglican Church in other parts of the world has brought out revisions of the Prayer Book adapted to local conditions. In America, after the Revolutionary War, our own Episcopal Church brought out the Prayer Book of 1789 in which it was made quite clear that this Church is "far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of Doctrine, Discipline, or Worship." Later revisions of the Prayer Book in this country were made in 1892 and in 1928.

The Prayer Book is not only a rich heritage and treasure of the past which has stood the test of time, but it is a glorious tool of the present, and a basis for advance in the future.

The Book of Common Prayer is a great bond of unity within the Anglican Communion and the Episcopal Church in America. Here we find the Christian community united in worship, but to have this unity we must all—every type of churchmanship or "school of thought"—be loyal to the Prayer Book, the whole Prayer Book.

As the Prayer Book is one of the greatest forces in unifying our Church internally, so it should, could, and must be a powerful tool for the building of a reunited Christendom. To this end, I urge that reunion conferences with non-Anglicans should devote considerable time and study together to the Book of Common Prayer.

The Prayer Book is a Scriptural Book; some two-thirds of it is taken word for word out of the Holy Bible. This is part of its power. The

religion of the Prayer Book is the religion of the Bible and the religion of Christ's One Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

The Prayer Book is to be used not only in Church for corporate worship, but in the home for family prayers, and in private for individual devotions as well.

I hope the Society will continue throughout this year to promote the widespread observance of the 400th Anniversary of the first English Book of Common Prayer. The Lambeth Conference of 1948 was helpful in this matter by adopting the following resolution (78B):

> "The Conference urges that special services of thanksgiving be held in 1949 throughout the whole Anglican Communion to commemorate the English Books of Common Prayer, of which the first was published in 1549."

What can the Anglican Society do? What can we individual members do? First, we can have parish observances and services. Second, the clergy can encourage the lay members to read books such as Bishop Wilson's "Outline of the Prayer Book" (50¢); Pell and Dawley, "The Religion of the Prayer Book" (1.75); Boss' "The Prayer Book Reason Why" (75¢); Burgess' Romance of the Book of Common Prayer" (1.10). Third, individual prayers for the anniversary of the first Prayer Book. Fourth, celebrate the Holy Communion on or near the anniversary day (June 9th). Fifth, arrange a display of Prayer Books of various dates in the local public library. Sixth, the clergy can preach a sermon or sermons connected with the 400th anniversary. Seventh, parish study classes on the Book of Common Prayer can be most inspiring and educational (The National Council material provided this spring will be found useful).

I am happy to report that The Anglican Society (American Branch) now has the largest number of members in its history. Our membership list includes 11 Bishops, 212 Priests and 106 lay people, making a total of 329 members, scattered far and wide through all the States of this country and some of our extra continental and foreign missionary districts. It is hoped in the near future to print a complete list of our members in The Anglican, as it is bound to be interesting and encouraging to see the widespread and representative character of the membership.

In conclusion, I invite each priest of the Society during 1949 to observe the Anniversary of the Prayer Book by securing at least two or three new lay members and one fellow priest new member for the Society. Furthermore I urge each lay member to secure one or two new members either lay or clergy and thus extend the influence and further the cause of Prayer Book Christianity.

REPORT ON THE ANNUAL MEETING

By the Rev. Charles E. Hill.

The Annual Meeting of the American Branch of the Anglican Society was held in St. Stephen's Church, New York, of which the Rev. Dr. J. Wilson Sutton is Rector, on January 20. Evensong was at 5:00 P. M.—the Meeting at 5:30 and the Dinner at 7:00. It was a singularly successful meeting. Interesting addresses, with practical suggestions, were made at the Meeting by the Rev. Dr. Dunphy and by Bishop Jenkins. The Secretary reported the membership as the largest ever,—11 bishops, 210 priests, 116 lay-people, a total of 337.

The President asked that each priest interest one lay person at least in his congregation to become a member, so as to increase our membership still further.

The Rev. Dr. Sutton reporting the printing and distribution of two leaflets, on "Missals" by Canon Daniels; on "The Prayer Book Anniversary" by Canon Hill; and the revised reprinting of another leaflet by the Rev. Francis Blake on the "Ceremonies of a Plain Celebration of the Holy Communion."

Elections were as follows:—

Honorary President, The Rt. Rev. Dr. G. Ashton Oldham, Bishop of Albany;

President, the Very Rev. Edward R. Welles, Dean of Buffalo;

Secretary, the Rev. Canon Charles E. Hill;

Treasurer, Mr. Wm. D. H. Lachmann.

The President appointed to the Executive Committee (in addition to the officers who are members ex officio):—

The Very Rev. H. S. Kennedy, Dean of Albany; the Rev. Dr. W. H. Dunphy, Rector of St. Mark's, Philadelphia; the Revds Allen W. Brown, Francis Blake, George L. Grambs.

He also appointed:—

Literary Editor, The Rev. Dr. Sutton, Editor of "The Anglican," the Rev. Dr. Dunphy, Chairman of the Extension Committee, the Rev. G. L. Grambs.

At the dinner following, a very helpful address on the Anniversary of the Prayer Book was made by our President, Dean Welles.

SOME SOURCES OF COMMON PRAYER

By the Rev. J. Joseph Meekin Harte.

Nineteen Hundred and Forty-Nine is being observed as a special Prayer Book Year, because it is the 400th anniversary of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. This does not mean that the contents of the Prayer Book date from 1549. The first Prayer Book of Edward VI was compiled from a great mass of sources, some new, most of them very old, of many varied origins. What happened in 1549 was that for the first time in history all of this material was gathered into a single volume, and this volume was placed in the hands of all the people.

The first requirement for such a volume was the invention of printing. As long as all books were hand-written, such a compilation would have been too expensive for general circulation, and far too bulky for any practical use.

The common Medieval practice was to use a number of manuscript volumes, each intended for a separate purpose. The altar book might contain only what was actually read from the altar. Epistles and Gospels would be gathered into one or two volumes, perhaps Epistles in one book and Gospels in another; or it might be half a year's readings in one, and half in the other. The choir would have only the parts actually intended for singing. Sometimes the choir used a volume so large that five or six persons could sing from it at once, as it lay, spread out on a lectern.

The occasional offices, such as baptism, marriage, burial, etc., were grouped in a book by themselves which could be carried about conveniently. This was called a manual, meaning literally a handbook.

Services used especially by a bishop, such as ordination, the consecration of churches, etc., were in another book called a pontifical, or bishop's book.

With the invention of printing, it was possible for the first time to gather all of these sources into a single book, and to place such a book in the hands of everyone, at a reasonable cost and in a convenient size.

The Table of Contents of the American Book of Common Prayer reflects this historic background by grouping the printed lines in such a manner as to show how they fall into separate classifications. In addition, throughout the body of the Book, each section has a separate title-page, so that a Prayer Book could be cut apart, and each section bound separately if anyone wished so to do.

The only element lacking in the new Book was provision for private and personal devotion. This new volume was to be a book of *Common* Prayer, that is, to be used in *public* worship. Many of the Prayer Book devotions lend themselves to private use, but that was not the object for which it was published.

In earlier times the laity had had private devotional books of widely varied character, suited to their varied states of piety, education and wealth. There were simple little Primers containing familiar prayers and the rudiments of Christian teaching, but these primers were mostly read to pieces and disappeared from the world long ago. Then there were all kinds of books of prayer for the regular cycle of daily prayer, called Books of Hours. Many of them are now museum pieces, exquisitely designed and beautifully illuminated works of art. These were made for the wealthy and the high-born. They varied as widely as their creators and users. The artists, illustrating the Church Kalendar, endeavored to illustrate the days and seasons contained therein. These Kalendar pages, reflecting the yearly life of their times, are among the most valued of historic records today. Artists showed the Blessed Virgin quite naturally reading her Book of Hours like any contemporary princess. Some of the Books of Hours were fuller than others, however, the basic devotions were the same. The Prayer Book Offices, Daily Morning and Evening Prayer, correspond to the older daily Hours.

The Medieval private books of devotion are otherwise represented today by the unnumerable private prayer books available. These books are private and personal, varying widely, but suited to their varied users, and fill a need that the Book of Common Prayer does not pretend to provide.

The Prayer Book is still the Book of *Common* Prayer in which all unite. The same prayers go up all over the world; the same words are repeated throughout the centuries; the same blessings hallow the lives of every churchman, from baptism to burial, from the greatest to the least.

> Our Mother the Church hath never a child
> To honor before the rest,
> But she sigheth the same for mightiest kings
> And the humblest babe on her breast;
> And the Bishop goes down to his narrow bed
> As the ploughman's child is laid,
> And alike she blesseth the dark-browed serf
> And the chief in his robes arrayed.

Because it is Common Prayer, we can enter into it with our hearts and understanding. Listening to the extempore prayer of a minister is like listening to the singing of a soloist, whereas Common Prayer is like congregational singing. If the speaker were an inspired saint with a genius for the rapid extempore composition of fine prose, it would be interesting and even edifying, but even so, the congregation could only follow as it follows a sermon, and not join in it.

The Prayer Book gives us one united voice. It saves us from the limitations, idiosyncracies, personal whims and desires of any one man, and it saves us from our own littleness. It protects us from such gaucheries as the newspaper account which reported that a certain minister on an occasion "uttered one of the most eloquent prayers ever addressed to a Boston audience." It permits those who are cut off by sickness or isolation to unite in spirit with their brethren in the Church the world over. It unites clergy and laity in one worship; steadies the Church's course when beset by contrary winds; teaches the Church's faith even when men's devotion is at a low ebb; and in time wins them back to the ancient truths that change not. The more one studies and knows the Prayer Book, and the more one loves it, just so loyal and devoted and intelligent will be his Churchmanship. It is a well known axiom, that the Prayer Book is the Church's best missionary. "If you plant a Prayer Book, a Churchman will grow up."

THE CONSECRATION OF THE EUCHARIST (Continued)

By the Rev. William H. Dunphy, Ph.D.

THE TEACHING OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

It is frequently asserted that the Church of England is committed to the Roman teaching that the Consecration of the Eucharist is effected by the mere recitation of our Lord's Words, "This is my Body: This is my Blood." This is very often treated as if it were axiomatic. And some writers have recently argued that the Episcopal Church in this country, despite the structure of its Prayer of Consecration, is committed to the same view because of the Preface to the Prayer Book. The allusion, of course, is to the statement, "This Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline or worship; or further than local circumstances require." It becomes, therefore, a matter of considerable importance to ascertain whether the Church of England is committed to the view that the "Words of Institution" by themselves suffice to consecrate.

Some very distinguished contemporary scholars can be quoted in favor of this point of view. Thus Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke speaks of two formulas proposed for the revised English Prayer Book in the 1920's, and says that they "were consistent with the English tradition that the 'Words of Institution' constitute Consecration." (p. 82—*The Prayer Book of 1928 Reconsidered*—London, S. P. C. K., 1943.) He finds fault with the Invocation in the Alternative Prayer Book of 1928,—an Invocation similar to our own American Epiklesis: "Seeking to understand the meaning of 'sanctify' as applied to the elements, we are confronted by a dilemma. Either they are already consecrated, in which case we ask what further sanctification is possible; or, if they are not consecrated, then the House of Bishops of the Church of England taught that the Church's practice since 1552, of regarding the Consecration as effected by the recital of the words 'This is my Body, etc.,' had been mistaken." (p. 46)

Similarly Dom Gregory Dix, in his chapter on "Consecration" in the Symposium *"The Liturgy"* (S. P. C. K., 1938) writes: "This answer, of course, involves the whole question of the Epiclesis, both as between Rome and the East, and between our own Book of Common Prayer and the unnecessarily 'foreign' proposals of 1928. (We have our own tradition on Consecration which has held for thirteen centuries, ever since England was a Christian country. It is both useless and provocative to try to run counter to that.)" (p. 107 f.)

The statements of these two distinguished theologians are quite clear. Unfortunately they are mistaken. Even before the Reformation the question was never finally closed whether the Consecration was effected solely by the so-called "Words of Institution" or whether the preceding prayer "Quam Oblationem" contributed to the Consecration. We must remember that in addition to the extreme Thomist view, the Scotist theory of consecration, which laid emphasis on the use of the whole Canon of the Mass, was held by many.

The first Prayer Book of Edward VI, as is well known, contained an invocation of the Holy Spirit preceding the narrative of the institution and our Lord's Words in connection with this. This specific invocation of the Holy Spirit was dropped in the 1552 Prayer Book, and in subsequent English Prayer Books. But there still remains the prayer, "Hear us O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's Holy Institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most Blessed Body and Blood: who, in the same night, etc." And many of the greatest theologians of

the Church of England have considered that it is by this prayer that the Holy Eucharist is consecrated, and not by the "Words of Institution" alone.

Dr. Richard Crakenthorp (1567-c. 1625) in his *Defensio Ecclesiae Anglicanae,* shows a thorough knowledge of the position of the early Church and the later Greek Church, and also of the Roman writers who rejected the extreme Thomist view. He attributes the consecration at the first Eucharist to the blessing of Christ and not simply to the words, "This is my Body, etc." He summarizes the arguments of the distinguished Roman Catholic writer Cheffontaines, or Caputfontium, and agrees that the Eucharist is consecrated by the Church's prayer, or rather by God's answer to that prayer. Similarly Bishop Thomas Morton (1564-1569) in his work, *The Institution of the Sacrament of the Blessed Bodie and Blood of Christ,* considers that our Lord's Words, "This is my Body, etc." are words of declaration and not of invocation, and rejects very definitely the "now Romish doctrine of consecrating by reciting these words, 'This is my Body, etc.' "

John Cosin (1595-1672), Bishop of Durham, ranks as one of the greatest seventeenth century theologians of the Church of England. He writes, "Then rising up (the priest) through solemn prayers containing the institution of the Sacrament and the very words of Christ instituting it . . . blesses both symbols and consecrates them into the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ." (Cosin's *Works,* Vol. 4, p. 359—Library of Anglo Catholic Theology.) [1]

Elsewhere he remarks that the Prayer of Consecration "consists of a commemoration of the unique sacrifice offered by Christ on the Cross once for all, of the history and institution of the Sacrament, along with the prayer that with the blessed bread and wine we may partake of the Body and Blood of Christ. (*Works,* vol. 5, p. 332.)

Elsewhere he speaks of the "sacred symbols sanctified by His Words and prayers" which "Christ handed to His disciples." (Vol. 4, p. 358, cf. pp. 175 and 359.)

Bishop Cosin himself preferred an Invocation directly asking God to bless and sanctify, "by the powers of thy Holy Word and Spirit," the bread and the wine. But he speaks in many places of the prayer as a whole effecting the Consecration.

Likewise Bishop William Forbes (c. 1585-1634) in his *Considerationes Modestae* deals with the question "by what Words the Consecra-

(1) Deinde, sese erigens, per preces solennes institutionem Sacramenti et ipsa Christi instituentis verba continentes, panem in manus acceptum frangens, vinumque in calicem effundens, utrumque symbolum benedicit, atque in Sacramentum Corporis et Sanguinis Christi consecrat.

tion of the Eucharist is effected." He says, "All the more sound Protestants [2] admit that the words by which the Eucharist is consecrated ought to be consecrative and not merely homiletic; that is, that they ought not to be spoken for the mere purpose of instructing the people, but also, nay rather, in order to consecrate the Eucharist. But the greater part altogether deny that the consecration is performed by these words and these alone, 'This is My Body,' and 'This is My Blood,' as Romanists contend against the Greeks. For they think that the consecration is effected not by these words of Christ alone, but by the mystical prayer also whereby the descent of the Holy Ghost is implored, that He may sanctify the elements; and so by the whole service in so far as it is performed, both by the minister and the communicants, according to Christ's institution.

"The Scripture, it is true, favours more the opinion of Protestants, and very many of the Fathers say repeatedly that the elements are consecrated by prayer and invocation." (Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology: *Works,* p. 531, vol. 2.)

He quotes many theologians in support of this point of view and urges "that nothing should be defined hastily and as if it were of faith." (Ibid., p. 537.)

Archbishop Bramhall (1593-1663) raises the question whether the Consecration is accomplished by the "enunciation of the Words of Christ as it is observed in the Western Church, or by prayer, as it is practiced in the Eastern Church; or whether these two be both the same thing in effect, that is, that the forms of the Sacraments be mystical prayers, and implicit invocations. Our Church for more abundant caution useth both forms." (*Works*—A. C. L., Vol. III, p. 165.)

It is abundantly clear that Bramhall did not consider the Church of England to be committed to the Roman view of Consecration.

Jeremy Taylor, one of the greatest theologians the Church of England has ever produced, attributes the Consecration of the Holy Eucharist to prayer and not to the bare recitation of the Dominical Words. He says, "In the consecration of the mysterious sacrament, the people have their portion; for the bishop or the priest blesses, and the people, by saying 'Amen' to the mystic prayer is partaker of the power, and the whole church hath a share in the power of spiritual sacrifice." (*The Sermons of the Rt. Rev. Jeremy Taylor, D. D.,* p. 528, N. Y. 1850.)

In another sermon he reproduces practically word for word the thought of Pope Gelasius, "How shall he reconcile the penitents, who is himself at

(2) This word is, of course, used in the older sense of non-Roman, not non-Catholic. In the seventeenth century it frequently was used of an Anglican as distinct from a Romanist or a sectarian.

enmity with God? How shall the Holy Spirit of God descend upon the symbols at *his* prayer, who does perpetually grieve him, and quench his holy fires, and drive him quite away?" (Ibid., p. 438.)

In his *Dissuasive from Popery* he distinctly rejects the Roman theory of Consecration by the repetition of our Lord's Words and asserts that our Lord consecrated by blessing or praying over the Elements, and that the Church still consecrates the same way. It is interesting to know that during the Commonwealth, when the use of the Prayer Book was banned, Jeremy Taylor drew up a Form of Service for the Consecration of the Eucharist which included an explicit Invocation of the Holy Spirit, both upon the Gifts and upon the communicants. The language used is strongly reminiscent of the language of St. John Chrysostom.

Herbert Thorndike (1598-1672) is perhaps the ablest theologian the Church of England has produced since the Reformation. He examines the opinion of the scholastic theologians of the Middle Ages that the Eucharist is consecrated by the recital of our Lord's Words in the Canon. He rejects this opinion as contrary to common sense. "For when our Lord takes the elements in His hands and blesses them (or gives God thanks over them), then breaks the bread, and, delivering them, bids His disciples take and eat them, because they are so called in regard of something which He had already done about them, when, delivering them, He calls them at that present time of delivering them, that which He could not call them afore, His 'Body and Blood?'" (Thorndike's *Works*—Vol. IV, part 1, p. 51; A. C. L.)

He shows clearly that our Lord consecrated by blessing or thanksgiving. "And is not Christ said to have 'blessed' the elements? Is it not said, that, having 'taken' and 'blessed' and 'broken' the bread, delivering it to His disciples, He affirmed it to be His Body at the present when He delivered it? Can the becoming of it His Body be imputed to the 'taking,' or 'breaking,' or 'delivering' of it? Doth it not remain then, that it be imputed to the 'blessing' of it?

"Here, finding it evident, by comparing the evangelists one with another and with St. Paul, that 'blessing' and 'giving of thanks,' in this case, are both one and the same thing signified by two words; I must needs infer, that blessing the elements is nothing else, but giving God thanks over them (which at the present our Lord had in hand), with intent to make them the sacrament of His Body and Blood. The people of God, in our Lord's time, were wont to take nothing for meat or for drink without first giving God thanks solemnly for it, as they had it in hand." (Ibid., p. 52 f.)

He quotes St. Paul—or the author of the pastoral Epistles—" 'Every creature of God is good, and none to be rejected, received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer:' the word of God enabling Christians to receive it with a good conscience, so as they may expect God's blessing, which they have desired by their prayers. For is it not manifest, that (having said, that 'every creature is good' which a Christian 'receives with thanksgiving'), when he adds that 'it is sanctified by prayer,' grounded on God's words,[3] he includes in that thanksgiving, which he means, prayer to God for a blessing upon it? The creatures of God then are sanctified to the nourishment of our bodies by thanksgiving, with prayer for God's blessing; and shall we think, that that thanksgiving, wherewith they are sanctified to the nourishment of our souls, doth not include prayer to the effect intended, that they may become Body and Blood of Christ, which God by this sacrament pretends to feed our souls with? And doth not the execution of our Saviour's institution, when He says, 'Do this,' consist in giving God thanks for the redemption of mankind, with prayer, that we may be fed by the Flesh and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist?" (Ibid., p. 53.)

He quotes the Fathers and the Liturgies of the Church abundantly to show that this view has the consent of the Universal Church herself.

Elsewhere he gives a very able summary of the whole question. "The Greek Church holds, that consecration is done by the prayers of the Church:[4] the Latin Church,[5] by the words of our Lord, 'This is My Body —This is My Blood of the New Testament;' which they call 'operating,' because the repeating of them they say makes the change. This conceit hath in it more appearance of magic, than of the word of God, if we take it as it sounds; which we have no reason to do. For the institution of our Lord being executed by celebrating the sacrament; and the celebration of the sacrament requiring a prayer, that the presence of the Body and Blood, which the institution promises, may be made good: what doubt is there, that this produces the effect? But by the virtue of the institution; containing the narrative of what our Lord did, and commanded to be done. And therefore those words are to be repeated in celebrating the sacrament; not as 'operating,' but as signifying the promise which the precept insinuates, when our Lord said, 'Do this in remembrance of Me.' For so are we assured, that the elements, which the Church consecrates, are the Body and Blood of Christ; as those were, whereof our Lord speaks. And therefore it was our Lord's 'blessing' or 'thanksgiving,' which made

(3) So in folio edition; qu. "word."
(4) See Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. x.
(5) See Epilogue, ibid. § 1, and Review of Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. x, §§ 3, 4.

them so; according to an observation in my book,[6] that eulogia and eucharistia signifies no less than the celebration of the Eucharist in the ancient fathers. What the thanksgiving used in the services, that are extant, was wont to contain, is there to be seen.[7] But it ended in a prayer; —that the Holy Ghost may come down upon the elements proposed, to make them the Body and Blood of Christ." (Thorndike's *Works*—Vol. V, p. 544 f. A. C. L.)

Thorndike is well aware that an *explicit* Invocation of the Holy Spirit is not necessary for Consecration. In fact he deals with the supposed opinion of St. Gregory the Great that the Apostles consecrated by the use of the Lord's Prayer, and says that if the Lord's Prayer were recited with the clause "Give us this day our daily bread," as a petition for the gift of our Lord's Body and Blood in the Eucharist, such Consecration would be valid. But he shows indisputably the baselessness and the absurdity of the scholastic opinion.

Charles Wheatly (1686-1742) is one of the greatest liturgists the Church of England has produced since the Reformation. His *Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer* appeared first in 1710 and passed through many editions, including at least one in America. It was until comparatively recent times generally read by candidates for Holy Orders. Wheatly teaches quite clearly that our Lord consecrated the bread and wine by "blessing them and giving thanks." (p. 319—Boston, 1825 Ed.)

"All the Church's Liturgies have contained a prayer of this nature. But besides this, there was always inserted in the primitive forms a particular petition for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the sacramental Elements, which was also continued in the first Liturgy of King Edward VI in very express and open terms. *Here us, O merciful Father, we beseech thee, and with thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, who in the same night, &c.* This, upon the scruples of Bucer, (whom I am sorry I have so often occasion to name,) was left out at the review in the fifth of King Edward; and the following sentence, which he was pleased to allow of, inserted in its stead; viz. *Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of Bread and Wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy Institution, in remembrance of his Death and Passion, may*

(6) Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. x, § 40. See also Epilogue, Bk. III of the Laws of the Ch., c. iv, § 6, sq., c. xxiii, § 1, sq.; Just Weights and Measures, c. xv, § 9.
(7) Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., ibid. §§ 41-43.

be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood, who in the same night, &c. In these words, it is true, the sense of the former is still implied, and consequently by these the Elements are now consecrated, and so become the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ." (Ibid., p. 319.)

It is to be noted that the judicious Wheatly, though regretting the changes made in the English Prayer of Consecration at the instance of foreign Reformers, yet considers the prayer, "Hear us, O merciful Father, etc." to be a true Invocation of the Holy Spirit, no less than the explicit prayer to this effect contained in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. He definitely rejects the scholastic theory of Consecration, "though all churches in the world have, through all ages, used the words of Institution at the time of Consecration; yet none, I believe, except the Church of Rome, ever before attributed the Consecration to the bare pronouncing of those words only: that was always attributed, by the most ancient fathers to the prayer of the Church." (Ibid., p. 320.)

The vast historical and theological knowledge of Joseph Bingham leads him to similar conclusions. (*Antiquities*—Book 15: Chap. 3, sec. 11.) *The Unbloody Sacrifice* by John Johnson is a masterly exposition of the whole subject. (Library of Anglo Catholic Theology.) Hamon L'Estrange, *Alliance of Divine Offices*—(Library A. C. T.), the great Bishop Wilson, (*Works*—Vol. 7, p. 165, Library A. C. T.), Nelson, Anand, Bernard, Frank—(*Sermons,* Vol. 1, p. 362, Library A. C. T.) and many others could be quoted to the same purport. The question was thoroughly sifted by the great Divines of this golden age of Anglican theology—the seventeenth century and the early eighteenth—and they are very nearly unanimous in their conclusions.

Nor was their witness ever entirely forgotten in the Church of England. Thus the Tractarian Maskell, in his able work, *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England,* (London; Pickering, 1846), says, "Upon the consent of a thousand years of the Catholic Church, upon the united voice of the fathers of the first five centuries, and more than all upon the unvaried testimony of the primitive liturgies; we shall find that certain rites, at least three in number, were always observed in the consideration of the Holy Eucharist; and because we do so find them, we cannot be exceeding our due bounds, in supposing them to be essential . . . (p. cviii: cf. c, ciii ff., cxliif.).

"These three rites are the recital of the Words of Institution, the Oblation of the Elements, and a prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit to make them the Body and the Blood of Christ. All these are in the old liturgy of the English Church according to the various uses which were

permitted before 1548; they are expressly and in clear words in King Edward's first Book of 1549; less clearly but still in the Second Book of 1552; and lastly in our present Service." (p. cviii.)

Other Tractarians held similar views. Tract 81 quotes approvingly the Prayers of Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the old Galican Liturgy and also the Canon of the first Prayer Book of Edward VI.

As late as 1887 the distinguished theologian Robert Owen, in his *Treatise of Dogmatic Theology,* (p. 419 f., Hayes—London) says: "The Latin Church follows the Schoolmen in attributing the consecration of the elements of Bread and Wine to a mystic virtue in the act of reciting a portion only of our Lord's words in the original institution, namely, 'This is My Body'—'This is My Blood.' The Greek Church makes it depend on the Prayer in which she invokes the Holy Ghost to render the elements the Body and Blood of Christ; in other words, to be effected by the solemn 'Blessing' and 'Thanksgiving' which Christ Himself, following Rabbinical usage, employed at the institution, and which procured the Rite its special designation of *Eucharist.* S. Paul's words, that 'every creature of God is sanctified by the word of God and prayer,' (1 *Tim.* iv. 3-5) and his attaching such weight to the Eucharistic thanksgiving, (1 *Cor.* xiv. 16, 17), may afford a fair presumption that this, and not the rehearsal of the words of the Gospel, is the true solution of the question." (See Thorndike—*Laws of the Church,* Bk. III, ch. 4.)

Owen's testimony is all the more valuable when it is remembered that he was accused of being pro-Roman in his theology. Certainly he is not anti-Roman and no less certainly he was following in the footsteps of the great representative Anglican theologians of all ages.

It is amazing how completely a large number of present day members of the Church of England have forgotten the ancient tradition of their Church, which is also the tradition of the Catholic Church as a whole, and have unthinkingly adopted the medieval scholastic view favored by modern Rome. On the other hand other Churches of the Anglican communion which have been free of State control have tended toward the adoption of liturgical rites in line with ancient teaching. Thus the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Episcopal Church in the United States, the Church of South Africa and other Anglican Churches, have included an Invocation of the Holy Spirit in their Prayer of Consecration. The Church of England did likewise in the proposed Alternative Prayer Book of 1928. It is unfortunate that copyright restrictions and the vigorous propaganda conducted against this Book have prevented the majority of English Churchmen considering it on its own merits.

It is interesting and noteworthy that the Old Catholics, since their breach with Rome in 1870 (due to the imposition of the novel dogma of papal infallibility) have carefully re-examined the whole question. Some of their liturgies, notably the German and the Swiss, contain Invocations of the Holy Spirit before the narrative of the Institution. The Swiss Old Catholic liturgy prints the words of the Prayer invoking the Holy Spirit in large capitals, equally with the "Words of Institution." (*Old Catholic Eucharistic Worship,* p. 75. By W. H. DeVoil and H. D. Wynne-Bennett —Faith Press, London; Morehouse, N. Y., 1936.)

Since the Old Catholics, though anti-Roman, are so distinctly Western in their outlook, and so strongly grounded on the Fathers, their testimony is all the more valuable.

Lack of space has precluded any attention to the Non-Jurors and to their valuable witness to the ancient teaching of the Church Catholic. But the quotations I have made from representative Anglican Divines of the highest authority are sufficient proof that the Church of England never committed herself to the scholastic and Roman theory of Consecration. In spite of her truncated liturgy, the Church continued to hold, at least implicitly, the ancient Catholic teaching of Consecration by prayer and by the action of the Holy Spirit, and this implicit teaching has happily become explicit in the liturgies of Sister and Daughter Churches, as well as in the Alternative Book of 1928. These facts are worthy of much more attention than they commonly receive, and not least because they are symptomatic of the fact that many are reacting against that neglect of the Holy Spirit which has been so sadly obvious in the thought and life of Western Christendom for many centuries.

(To be concluded)

THE MOVEMENT OF THE LITURGY! (Continued)

By the Editor.

Now we are ready to offer the Sacrifice. We have brought our bread and wine, symbolizing the natural Gifts of God the Creator, which we have so misused and stained, but which have been cleansed by God the Redeemer—and we come to offer these gifts to God as the symbols of the Body broken on the Cross, and the Blood poured out for our salvation. As we offer them, God sends down His Holy Spirit to make them what they symbolize, the Body and Blood of our Redeemer. Our earthly offer-

ing is to be united with the Heavenly Offering, the Sacrifice which our Lord made on the Cross, and which abides forever in the Heavenly sphere. And to show that the great Act takes place, not so much on earth as in Heaven; to show that we are about to be lifted up into the Presence of the Eternal Sacrifice which we come to plead and present to the Father, the priest turns to the people and says, "Lift up your hearts." They reply, "We lift them up unto the Lord." The priest continues, "Let us give thanks unto our Lord God." (The Eucharist takes its name from this giving of thanks.) The congregation replies, "It is meet and right so to do." The priest then launches into the great Thanksgiving, into the very heart of the Eucharistic Act. But it is not only the earthly priest and earthly congregation who unite in offering the Sacrifice. Rather it is in union with Angels and Archangels and all the Company of Heaven that we adore God and offer Him the Holy Gifts. It is, therefore, most appropriate that at this time we sing the triumph song of Heaven itself, the song of the seraphim—"Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts, Heaven and earth are full of thy glory: Glory be to thee, O Lord Most High. Amen."

In our study of the Eucharistic Liturgy, we have reached the Prayer of Consecration, beginning with the ascription of glory to God for the redemption of the world, and continuing with the narrative of the Institution by our Lord of "a perpetual memory of that His precious death and sacrifice until His coming again." Our minds go back to the Upper Room, where, as the dark shadows of the Passion draw near, our Lord breaks bread and gives it to His Apostles saying, "Take, eat, this is my body," and after supper gives them the cup saying, "This is my blood. Do this for my memorial." We take our Lord's words at their full face value and come to do what He commanded us to do.

It must be noticed in passing that these words of our Lord ("this is my body," "this is my blood") do not of themselves effect the consecration. They were our Lord's words of administration, not the words of consecration. The Prayer of Consecration which He used was in the form of a blessing. We do not know what His exact words were, nor do we need to know. We recite the narrative of the Institution simply as the ground and authority for what we are about to do, that is to say, offer the holy Gifts and ask that God will send His Holy Spirit to make them the Body and Blood of our Lord.

Accordingly we now have the oblation of the holy bread and wine as the memorial, not only of our Lord's blessed Passion and precious Death,

but also of His mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension, and we give God most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same.

We now come to the final and most important part of the Prayer of Consecration, the Invocation. We pray God "to bless and sanctify, with His Word and Holy Spirit, these His gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we, receiving them according to His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood."

Now the Consecration is complete. Now there lies upon our Altar, under the earthly veils of bread and wine, the great and dread sacrifice by which the world was redeemed, the sacred Body and Blood of our Lord. How the earthly elements, without ceasing to be bread and wine, can become the Resurrection Body and Blood of our Lord, we do not presume to say. We do not profess to know whether it is by transubstantiation or consubstantiation, or by some other method. All we know is that the Elements have become what our Lord pronounced them to be, by the action of God's Holy Spirit. The same Holy Spirit has caught up our earthly offering of bread and wine into union with the Eternal Offering of our Lord in the heavenly sphere. We are caught up into the Presence of the Eternal Sacrifice, and in union with the Sacrifice of our Lord, we offer ourselves, our souls and bodies to be a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice unto God. It is only in union with Him, the Lamb of God, once slain but alive forevermore, that we dare to offer our sin-stained selves to God.

"Look, Father, look on his anointed face,
And only look on us as found in him;
Look not on our misusings of thy grace,
Our prayer so languid, and our faith so dim;
For lo! between our sins and their reward,
We set the passion of thy Son our Lord."

The Eucharist is the means by which we offer the sacrifice of our Lord's death to the Father, and by which the benefits of Calvary flow to us. The Eucharist is "our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," that is, the great act by which we praise and thank God for the redemption He has wrought by His Son's death. As we offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice we pray that by the merits and death of Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all God's whole Church may obtain remission of our

sins and all other benefits of His passion. In praying for the whole Church we are, of course, including the faithful departed. The Eucharist is offered for them, no less than for the faithful now living on earth. Through the Holy Eucharist the benefits of our Lord's death are extended to them as well as to us. And in union with our Lord we offer "ourselves, our souls and bodies to be a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice" to God, "humbly beseeching thee, that we, and all others who shall be partakers of this Holy Communion, may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus Christ, be filled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with Him, that He may dwell in us, and we in Him."

We should notice the wording of this prayer very carefully. The Church does not teach that we receive mere bread and wine in the Holy Communion. Rather we pray that we may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Christ. In so doing we are made one body with Him. If we worthily receive Him He dwells in us and we in Him. The phrase "one body" indicates the closeness of our union, not only with our Lord, but also with one another in Him. As a consequence of our Lord's sacrificial death, and by feeding on His sacrificed Body and Blood, we ourselves are made one body. Hence it is natural that after the Prayer of Consecration we at once say the "Our Father," showing ourselves to be one family, one living fellowship in Christ.

The Prayer of Humble Access which follows is one of the clearest expressions of the Real Presence of our Lord's Body and Blood in the Blessed Sacrament which is found anywhere in the Prayer Book. We declare ourselves unworthy of gathering up the crumbs under God's table. Self-abasement could go no deeper. But at the same time we confidently pray to God, trusting in His mercy, "Grant us, gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ and to drink His Blood that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body and our souls washed through His most precious Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him and He in us." Aspiration could go no higher.

(To be concluded)

AN ANGLICAN SOCIETY DIRECTORY

Honorary President: *The Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham, D. D.*
68 South Swan St.,
Albany 6, N. Y.

President: *The Very Rev. Edward R. Welles*
St. Paul's Cathedral,
Buffalo 2, N. Y.

Vice President: *The Rev. J. Wilson Sutton, D. D.*
1 West 72nd St.,
New York, N. Y.

Secretary: *The Rev. Charles E. Hill*
Twin Oaks,
Williamstown, Mass.

Treasurer: *Mr. William Lackman*
Livingston, Columbia Co., N. Y.

Chairman Extension Committee: *The Rev. George Grambs*
Bayonne, N. J.

West Coast Representative: *The Rev. Merrill A. Norton*
Barstow, California.

Southern Representative: *The Rev. Louis O. V. Thomas*
305 South Commerce St.,
Natchez, Mississippi.

Editor, THE ANGLICAN, *The Rev. William H. Dunphy, Ph. D.*
St. Mark's Church,
1625 Locust St.,
Philadelphia, Pa.